

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



γW.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/864,793	05/24/2001	Gregory Murphy	28122.90	2880
35690 75	590 10/04/2004		EXAMI	NER
MEYERTONS, HOOD, KIVLIN, KOWERT & GOETZEL, P.C.			MATTHEWS, WILLIAM H	
	P.O. BOX 398 AUSTIN, TX 78767-0398		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
11001111, 111	70.0. 0570		3738	
			DATE MAILED: 10/04/2004	28

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

_	_	\mathcal{A}				
	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	09/864,793	MURPHY ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	William H. Matthews (Howie)	3738				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	pears on the cover sheet with th	e correspondence address				
Period for Reply	VIO DET TO EVOIDE AMONT	THO FROM				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a rep - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailine earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be ly within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS fi e, cause the application to become ABANDC	e timely filed days will be considered timely. from the mailing date of this communication. NED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 h	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>19 May 2003</u> .					
2a)⊠ This action is FINAL . 2b)☐ This	☐ This action is FINAL. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.					
<i>,</i> —	☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11,	, 453 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims						
4) Claim(s) <u>15-19,25,27-38,40-50,52-62 and 64-</u>	Claim(s) <u>15-19,25,27-38,40-50,52-62 and 64-86</u> is/are pending in the application.					
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.	Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
•						
•	•					
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/	or election requirement.	*				
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
,	10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.					
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).					
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the						
The dath of declaration is objected to by the E	Administ. Note the attached On					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119	,					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).						
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:						
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage						
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
200 the attached detailed Chief defent for a list of the continue deploy not received.						
/						
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date						
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 	3) 5) Notice of Inform	nal Patent Application (PTO-152)				
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>2/28/03,5/18/03</u> .	6) ⊠ Other: <u>IDS of 8/</u>	1/03. 8/23/04, 9/22/04				

Application/Control Number: 09/864,793 Page 2

Art Unit: 3738

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 15-19,25,27-38,40-50,52-62,64-86 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Inventorship

1. The request to correct the inventorship of this nonprovisional application under 37 CFR 1.48(a) is deficient because:

An oath or declaration by each actual inventor or inventors listing the entire inventive entity has not been submitted. Specifically, the submitted declaration lacks a date for one inventor.

Claim Objections

2. Claims 42,45-50,54,57-62,66, and 69-74 objected to because of the following informalities: claims 45-50, 57-62, and 69-74 recite the exact limitations of claims 32-37 and claims 42, 54, and 66 recite the exact limitations of claim 29. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

⁽b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Art Unit: 3738

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 18,52,53,55,83 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Martin et al. US PN 6,162,537.

Martin et al. discloses a ventricular patch (lines 34-47 of col. 12) having a combination of fibers that are treated with radiopaque dyes before or after extrusion (see line 61 of col. 7 through line 58 of col. 8, lines 7-13 of col. 9, and line 59 of col. 9 through line 15 of col. 10). The second fiber may be polyester (lines 12-31 of col. 7) and the first component may be collagen (lines 25-41 of col. 6).

3. Claims 15,17,19,25,28,29,32,34-36,38,41,42,45,47-49,54,57,59-61,65,66,69, and 71-73 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Alt US PN 5,411,527.

Alt discloses a ventricular patch in figure 2 comprising metal thread markings or ink markings on a biocompatible surface in either a grid, parallel lines, or lines radiating from a point. See lines 42-52 of col. 10, lines 4-22 of col. 11, line 61 of col. 11 through line 2 of col. 12, lines 5-16 of col. 13, and lines 11-27 of col. 16.

4. Claims 18,19,53,65,69-73,83, and 86 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by Milijasevic US PN 4,938,231.

Application/Control Number: 09/864,793 Page 4

Art Unit: 3738

Milijasevic discloses a ventricular patch in figures 2 and 10 having radiopaque threads (platinum or stainless steel threads) enveloped by a polyester mesh. (see lines 34-62 of col. 3 and line 45 of col. 5 through line 25 of col. 6). Radiating line patterns (figure 10) or concentric circle patterns (figure 11) are disclosed.

5. Claims 15,17,19,28,32,34,38,41,45,47,57,59,65,69,71 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Baker, Jr. et al. US PN 4,821,723.

Baker Jr. et al. discloses in figures 1a-1b and lines 39-61 of col. 6 a ventricular patch comprising a plurality of radiopaque markings coupled to a sheet and arranged in a pattern of lines radiating from a single point, equally spaced parallel lines, or uniform grid of horizontal and vertical lines.

6. Claims 19,64,65,86 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by King et al. US PN 3,874,388.

King et al. discloses in figure 1c and lines 14-55 of col. 6 a ventricular patch comprising a plurality of radiopaque markings coupled to a sheet and arranged in a pattern of lines radiating from a single point. The sheet material may include pericardium which inherently contains collagen.

Application/Control Number: 09/864,793 Page 5

Art Unit: 3738

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 8. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alt US PN 5,411,527.

Alt discloses the use of metal threads in figure 2 and lines 34-40 of col. 11, but Alt does not disclose expressly the use of spacing set at 1cm.

At the time the invention was made, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use 1cm spacing because Applicant has not disclosed that using 1cm spacing provides an advantage, is used for a particular purpose, or solves a stated problem. One of ordinary skill in the art, furthermore, would have expected Applicant's invention to perform equally well with the spacing used by Alt because both would provide sufficient visibility under fluoroscopy during implantation of the patch.

Therefore, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to modify Alt to obtain the invention as specified in claim 16.

9. Claims 33,37,46,50,58,62,70, and 74 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alt US PN 5.411.527.

Application/Control Number: 09/864,793

Art Unit: 3738

Alt meets the structural limitations of claims 33,37,46,50,58,62,70, and 74 as described above, but lacks the express disclosure of using platinum threads or using ion deposition to deposit radiopaque substances to the markings. However, Alt discloses in lines 42-52 of col. 10 and lines 11-27 of col. 16 that platinum-iridium wires or other metals may be used, and that polymer threads may be used that are coated with radiopaque materials. Furthermore, the particular use of ion deposition or platinum is widely known in the art of medical devices in order to provide sufficient visibility under fluoroscopy during implantation.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have selected platinum as the material for the wire or to use ion deposition as a method of coating the polymer wires in order to provide sufficient visibility under fluoroscopy during implantation.

10. Claims 77,80,86 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alt US PN 5,411,527 as applied in the 102(b) rejection above, and in further view of Milijasevic US PN 4,938,231.

Alt meets the structural limitations of claims 26,39, and 63 as described above, but lacks the express disclosure of the biocompatible material comprising polyester.

Milijasevic teaches a ventricular patch enveloped by a polyester mesh in order to prevent burning of tissue during delivery of current. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the patch

Page 7

Application/Control Number: 09/864,793

Art Unit: 3738

disclosed by Alt by using a polyester mesh, as taught by Milijasevic, for the biocompatible material in order to prevent burning of tissue during delivery of current.

11. Claims 30,31,43,44,67,68 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baker, Jr. et al. US PN 4,821,723 as applied in the 102(b) rejection above and in further view of Zhong et al. US PN 6,368,356.

Baker, Jr. et al. meets the structural limitations of claims 30,31,43,44,67,68 as described above, but lacks the express disclosure of a polymer made with barium sulfate. Zhong et al. teaches a ventricular patch wherein the polymer base is embedded with barium sulfate filler material in order to provide sufficient visibility under fluoroscopy during implantation.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the patch disclosed by Baker, Jr. et al. by using a polymer made with barium sulfate in order to provide sufficient visibility under fluoroscopy during implantation as taught by Zhong et al.

Note MPEP 2113 (Product by Process) for claims 55 and 67. The claims are not limited by the manipulations of the recited steps, only the structure implied by the steps.

12. Claims 55,56,67, and 68 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Milijasevic US PN 4,938,231 as applied in the 102(b) rejection above and in further view of Zhong et al. US PN 6,368,356.

Art Unit: 3738

Milijasevic meets the structural limitations of claims 55,56,67, and 68 as described above, but lacks the express disclosure of a polymer made with barium sulfate. Zhong et al. teaches a ventricular patch wherein the polymer base is embedded with barium sulfate filler material in order to provide sufficient visibility under fluoroscopy during implantation.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the patch disclosed by Milijasevic by using a polymer made with barium sulfate in order to provide sufficient visibility under fluoroscopy during implantation as taught by Zhong et al.

Note MPEP 2113 (Product by Process) for claims 55 and 67. The claims are not limited by the manipulations of the recited steps, only the structure implied by the steps.

13. Claim 56 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Martin et al. US PN 6,162,537 as applied above in the 102(e) rejection, and in further view of Zhong et al. US PN 6,368,356.

Martin et al. meets the structural limitations of claim 56 as described above by disclosing a polymer material made with a radiopaque dye or pigment, but lacks the express disclosure of a polymer made with barium sulfate. Zhong et al. teaches a ventricular patch wherein the polymer base is embedded with barium sulfate filler material in order to provide sufficient visibility under fluoroscopy during implantation.

Application/Control Number: 09/864,793

Art Unit: 3738

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the patch disclosed by Martin et al. by using a polymer made with barium sulfate in order to provide sufficient visibility under fluoroscopy during implantation as taught by Zhong et al.

14. Claims 27,40,64,75,76,78,79,84, and 85 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alt US PN 5,411,527 or Baker Jr. et al. US PN 4,821,723 as applied above, and in further view of Buckberg et al. US PN 6,450,171.

Alt or Baker, Jr. et al. meet the structural limitations of claims 27,40,64,75,76,78,79,84, and 85 as described above, but lacks the express disclosure of using a sheet made with collagen, porcine tissue or bovine pericardium. Buckberg et al. teaches a ventricular patch wherein the sheet is made of collagen, porcine tissue or bovine pericardium in order to provide improved biocompatibility upon implantation.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the patch disclosed by Alt or Buckberg et al. by using a sheet made with collagen, porcine tissue or bovine pericardium in order to provide improved biocompatibility upon implantation as taught by Buckberg et al.

15. Claims 52,81,82 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Milijasevic US PN 4,938,231or Martin et al. US PN 6,162,537 as applied above, and in further view of Buckberg et al. US PN 6,450,171.

Art Unit: 3738

Milijasevic or Martin et al. meet the structural limitations of claims 52,81,82 as described above, but lacks the express disclosure of using a sheet made with collagen, porcine tissue or bovine pericardiuim. Buckberg et al. teaches a ventricular patch wherein the sheet is made of collagen, porcine tissue or bovine pericardiuim in order to provide improved biocompatibility upon implantation.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the patch disclosed by Milijasevic or Martin et al. by using a sheet made with collagen, porcine tissue or bovine pericardiuim in order to provide improved biocompatibility upon implantation as taught by Buckberg et al.

Conclusion

16. Applicant's submission of an information disclosure statement under 37 CFR 1.97(c) with the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(p) on 2/28/03 prompted the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE**FINAL. See MPEP § 609(B)(2)(i). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Application/Control Number: 09/864,793

Art Unit: 3738

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to William H. Matthews (Howie) whose telephone number

is 703-305-0316. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 10-

6:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Corrine M. McDermott can be reached on 703-308-2111. The fax phone

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-

872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

September 29, 2004

CORRINE McDERMOTT SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Page 11

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700